Albemarle County Planning Commission
February 5, 2013

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, February 5, 2013, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Ed Smith, Bruce Dotson, Thomas Loach, Richard Randolph, Don Franco, and Calvin Morris, Chairman. Absent was Russell (Mac) Lafferty, Vice Chairman. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was absent.

Other officials present were Sarah Baldwin, Senior Planner; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Morris, Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Deferred Item:

SP-2012-00010 Sieg Special Events
PROPOSAL: Special use permit for Special Events (weddings, rehearsal dinners, and other celebrations) to be located at existing family property.
ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots)
SECTION: Chapter 18 Section 10.2.2.50 of the Albemarle County Code, which allows for Special events (reference 5.1.43)
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Rural Area 2 - Rural Areas – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots)
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No
LOCATION: 1291/1293 Hammocks Gap Road
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 06300-00-00-02900
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna
(Chris Perez)
DEFERRED FROM THE DECEMBER 21, 2012 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Mr. Morris announced that SP-2012-00010 Sieg Special Events had been removed from the agenda because the applicant has withdrawn the application.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

Mr. Morris invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda.

Nancy Carpenter, speaking as an advocate for affordable housing and the homeless, encouraged the Planning Commission to pursue programs, opportunities and Comp Plan policies that emphasize the provision of affordable housing and prevent homelessness for individuals and families. There is a lack of affordable rental housing. Hopefully with the Comprehensive Plan that the city and county are working towards the visions, goals and priorities that affordable rental housing will be a paramount issue. Not everybody is ready for home ownership and the County needs to make sure our low income citizens are covered with safe stable descent housing.

There being no further comments, the meeting moved to the next item.

Committee Reports

Mr. Morris invited committee reports.

- Mr. Smith reported that the Master Planning Committee met yesterday. Jeff Sitzler, Soil Engineer for UVA and Julie Monteith presented the new regulations coming up for MS-4, which goes into effect July, 2013. Other items discussed were the replacement of the bridge over Emmett Street between commencement and the end of July/August and the bike share program at UVA.
- Mr. Morris reported the Pantops Advisory Commission last met at last month's group meeting. A couple of items came up and staff will be attending the meeting on February 11th. They will start looking for possible changes/revisions to their master plan.
- Mr. Smith asked if anyone attended the agri tourism meeting last Monday. No one attended. He asked staff to provide him with records of that meeting.

There being no other committee reports, the meeting moved to the next item.

Consent Agenda:

Approval of Minutes: 11-13-2012

Mr. Morris asked if any Commissioner wanted to pull an item from the consent agenda.

Motion: Mr. Franco moved and Mr. Dotson seconded for acceptance of the consent agenda.

The motion carried by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Morris noted the consent agenda item was approved.

Public Hearing Item:

SP-2012-00031 Verizon Wireless "Eastham" Fox Property Tier III Personal Wireless Service Facility

PROPOSED: Request for installation of a 110 foot steel monopole with two (2) flush mounted arrays and associated ground equipment with fencing within a 2,250 square foot lease area.
ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: RA, Rural Areas- agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots);
EC Entrance Corridor – Overlay to protect properties of historic, architectural or cultural significance from visual impacts of development along routes of tourist access.
SECTION: 10.2.2.48 Tier III personal wireless facilities
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Rural Areas in Rural Area 2 - preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots).
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: YES
LOCATION: 3070 Stony Point Road
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 04700-00-00-01800
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna
(Sarah Baldwin)

Sarah Baldwin presented a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report.

This property is located on tax map 47, parcel 18. It does contain a dwelling that is located on a steep hill. This is a request for installation of a 110 foot tall monopole structure with two (2) flush mounted arrays and ground equipment within a 2,250 square foot lease area. The applicant is requesting two (2) waivers which staff is supporting.

The tower will be approximately 15 feet taller than reference tree, which is a 94.7 AGL black oak. Additionally, one of the proposed antennas will be 1,581 square feet, which exceeds the Ordinance requirements

Staff attended a balloon test on January 11, 2013 and viewed the balloon from various areas. There were brief certain points that were camouflaged by trees, but also some brief points that did show the balloon. The applicant provided a location map showing where it is visible. She referred to several photo simulations provided by the applicant of some of the visible locations:

Factors Favorable:
1. The proposal will provide improved 3G and 4G wireless service for the surrounding area.
2. The Architectural Review Board staff has recommended approval of the proposed monopole and associated ground equipment stating that the location is expected to sufficiently minimize its visibility.
3. The proposal meets all of the requirements of 5.1.40 (with waivers that are supported by staff.

Factors Unfavorable:
1. None identified.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of this Tier III Personal Service Wireless Facility with the modifications (special exceptions) provided herein.

Should the Planning Commission choose to recommend approval of this application to the Board of Supervisors, staff recommends the following condition:

1. Development and use shall be in general accord with what is described in the applicant's request and site plans, entitled "Eastham," with a final zoning drawing submittal date of 11/06/12 (hereafter "Conceptual Plan"), as determined by the Director of Planning and Zoning Administrator.

   Minor modifications to the plan which do not conflict with the elements above may be made to ensure compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff.

Mr. Dotson said in the staff report it was mentioned given the size and shape of the parcel that an easement would be sought from an adjacent property for the fall zone. He asked if that is a condition of the approval or something already in the ordinance that does not need a condition.

Ms. Baldwin replied that it was already a condition in the ordinance. If it is determined the lot is of a certain size then that is a requirement. Staff has a copy of the easement.

Mr. Benish pointed out the easement has been obtained.

Mr. Randolph asked if there was another application that has come before the Commission for a Tier III where they are looking to waive the height, the setback for the rural area, and the antenna size. He asked staff to cite a precedent of another case where all three of those factors have been waived.

Mr. Baldwin replied she did not know of an example with all three factors. However, she knows that the antenna size as well as the reference tree and possibly some other modifications have been waived at the same time.

Mr. Benish pointed out he believed there was one recently approved on Route 29 south in the North Garden area, which he thought needed an easement for the fall zone. It is not uncommon to have at least two of those three factors in some combination.

Mr. Randolph said he was just struck that there were three waivers here. In the past they have certainly looked at waivers for height and antenna size. It seemed to be a little unusual from that standpoint. He questioned precedence in the request for all three modifications.

Mr. Benish said the third waiver is related to a safety issue of the fall zone where the other two are more visibility issues. He can't recall a combination where they have had all three. However, it is not uncommon to have some combination of two of those three factors, which address different issues.

Mr. Loach asked if they have made a change in standards from the normal 7' to 10', which has come down from the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Benish replied no, that from the general ordinance guidelines visibility primarily guides staff. However, as they review sites and determine the extent of the visibility they have been willing to grant exceptions for that.

Mr. Loach pointed out it seems like the last time the height was 7' to 10'.

Mr. Benish noted that further south on Route 20 they have had two applications that were actually approved at 30' and 40'. Those two were on a very large tract of land. That site may have a fall zone requirement because it is right at the corner of the property and set about 400' off of Route 20. However, the monopoles are very tall.

Mr. Morris pointed out when he attended the balloon test he found the site is well above the road. Watching from Stony Point Road, which is like a roller coaster, the antenna was not visible. He was literally on top of the balloon before he looked up and saw it was a balloon. It is a very interesting site and one that is probably not going to be visible either moving north or south on Stony Point Road. The Black Oak is a huge tree.

Mr. Benish said he thinks Mr. Randolph's intent is to indicate certain exceptions to this. However, the fall zone area is just a requirement. If the setbacks are not met, then a fall zone agreement is obtained. It is not a waiver or special exception.

Mr. Dotson said he had a question for Mr. Kamptner. Reading in the staff report on page 8 it is talking about 7' and 10'. It says the Commission may approve the height up to 10'. He asked if there is something else that says "or more" since they were being asked for 15'. He was just curious what the ordinance provided.

Mr. Kamptner replied that was the special exception, which was the modification of that particular regulation. Any regulation of Section 5 of the zoning ordinance can be modified and the process is the special exception. That is the section that allows this request to go up to 15'.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff. There being none, he opened the public hearing for the applicant and public comment. He invited the applicant to come forward and address the Planning Commission.

Laurie Schweller, an attorney with LeClair Ryan, represented Verizon Wireless and presented a PowerPoint presentation.

- The reason they are requesting a special use permit for a Tier III is basically for two reasons. One is that they need more than 10' above the reference tree to serve their radio frequency needs in this area. Therefore, they are requesting 15'. The other reason is because it is an avoidance area and would not qualify as a Tier II. It is in the Southwest Mountains Rural Historic District. The site is wooded and they believe the visibility is kept to a minimum because of the trees,

backdrops, and the sets of antenna are flush mounted and painted brown. That would cause this to be a Tier III application.

- They have obtained a fall zone easement from the neighbor whose property surrounds this site on three sides. Therefore, they can comply with the requirement of the 110' setback that being the height of the monopole itself. Again, they are doing a monopole with two sets of flush mounted antennas so they can do the LTE at the top set and then a dual antenna for PCS and cell on the second set. That is why they needed the full 15' feet they are requesting above the reference tree to get both of those sets of antenna up there.

- The current coverage map shows good coverage along Route 20 going north and south. To the east of that along Route 20 the coverage is not as good. With this site they are hoping to improve this particular area in the eastern part since it would connect with existing sites to have continued coverage. Again, as Ms. Baldwin pointed out, they did a balloon test on January 11th. Coming up from Charlottesville, as Mr. Morris explained, it is very difficult to see the site. From most locations along the road it would not be visible since it is at a high elevation. Directly east of the site, from the house next door, the balloon was seen just above the trees. The balloon was not visible from Wood Creek Drive, from Rivanna Farm, and farther south at the corner of Stony Point Road and Profit Road.

Mr. Morris invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Dotson asked in what way is the one antenna larger. He asked if it looked like the other one, but was taller.

Ms. Schweller replied the larger antenna looks similar to the others, but the square inch area is larger. The LTE antennas tend to be larger to provide higher strength. They also have the dual antennas that have both the 850 and 1,950 in them. Sometimes those are larger as well. She did not know which of the six antennas will be larger.

Mr. Dotson asked if having this larger antenna was part of their new norm and if each tower would raise the same issue of having an antenna that exceeds the ordinance.

Ms. Schweller replied she did see it frequently. In fact, she would guess they are going to see it more and more frequently. They have suggested considerations for ordinance revision that square inch limitation be removed because they have a variety of antennas they need to use.

Mr. Randolph asked about the height of the monopole and if our county requirement is also outdated because of the pace of technology.

Ms. Schweller indicated that the antenna needs to be 15' higher that the largest neighboring adjoining tree.

Mr. Randolph asked if the county needs to revisit that requirement.

Ms. Schweller replied yes; however, she believed the county is revisiting that requirement. She knows Bill Fritz is working steadily on the special project of updating the ordinance. In fact, Mr. Fritz has invited industry representatives to a couple of round tables to discuss that. They have not only the three frequencies or technologies that she mentions to the Commission frequently, but they have more technologies coming down the pike. The process is going to start all over again the next time they have a new technology that they need to get up on each site for all of the extensions for LTE, which they have requested over the past year and a half. From the industry's point of view the best way to handle that is with a full array. In other words, the antennas would not be flush mounted because it is a better way to propagate those signals. It is cleaner and has more separation between the frequencies. They would have more redundancy in case something goes down because of the 360 degree propagation. There are lots of reasons why the industry prefers it. However, the reason why localities sometime accept it is because with a full array they can get all of the technologies for a single carrier at one point on the monopole, which leaves room for other carriers to provide their technologies on the same pole. It is a policy decision obviously because Albemarle County has decided in the past they would prefer to have more monopoles as long as the antennas are flush mounted. However, it is getting to the point where each carrier has to have more than one set of antennas. Monopoles are just going to get taller and taller as they have to put more technologies on the same monopole.

Mr. Randolph said that is very helpful. However, he has one other question. They have previously seen applications that show the extent of the impact on the site for where the trees are going to be removed. On page 5, it says the applicant has stated the installation of the proposed personal wireless service facility will not require the removal of any significant trees. He asked what a significant tree is. That could be defined as everything less than a tree that is 100 years old that could come down because they define significant as old trees.

Ms. Schweller said it is defined, but she can't recall exactly what that diameter is.

Mr. Randolph asked roughly how many trees are going to come down.

Drew Patterson, consultant for Verizon with NB&C, noted in visiting the site and dealing with their A&E firm he did not anticipate that any trees will have to come down. They indicated no trees of significant size. Really what they are dealing with basically is twigs. In visiting the actual tower site he found the site is already cleared. Therefore, he did not think they are going to have to take down any trees.

Mr. Morris agreed because there were no other trees in the intermediate area except the reference tree. The only thing that could be damaged is the dog house or chicken coop.

Ms. Baldwin agreed. When she attended the balloon test it did not seem there was any significant trees right around the intermediate area where the monopole would be.

Mr. Morris pointed out the only concern he heard from people in the area was about the

driveway. About 50 yards after coming off of Route 20 someone would have to take almost a U-turn to go up the driveway to where the site is. The residents were extremely concerned about trucks deteriorating the driveway on that sharp turn area. He had mentioned this to the applicant and asked if she cared to address that situation.

Ms. Schweller replied Verizon Wireless has become aware of this question regarding that portion of the driveway from Route 20 to where it turns off to the subject property. They would be willing to add gravel or regrade and add gravel. They would do whatever needs to be done to either avoid damaging it or repair damage that would be done by any trucks for construction. They do want to have the driveway in good condition because they will have a service person go up once a month to check anyway.

Mr. Morris said that was great. He suggested when this application goes to the Board of Supervisors if that question is already addressed it would be great. There being no further questions for the applicant, he invited public comment.

Mr. Fleming said he owns property with his brother right across the road from the proposed site. It is the last piece of 106 acres that his parents bought back in 1959. The property has been in their family for over 50 years. They are attached to the land for sentimental reasons although there is no longer a residence on the land. When his mother died they found the house to be in such poor condition and not feasible to renovate so they simply had it torn down. However, they plan to put one and possibly two houses back up on that site. He provided a couple of panoramic pictures of their view of the proposed tower site. It is not the end of the world, but certainly the proposed monopole would be detrimental to the view. The view was the main asset of their real estate at this time other than the ability to grow the usual hay or soy beans. The view is the selling point for this piece of land if they decide to sell. (Attachment – Two Photos submitted by Mr. Fleming on file with minutes in office of clerk) (BOS see separate .pdf file)

Mr. Fleming pointed out they have heard mention of studies that were done where Verizon apparently went around and estimated where the monopole would be visible from. There may be a number of other properties around which may have an unobstructed view of the proposed monopole. He knows of at least one gentleman who lives adjacent to the property, who was unable to attend tonight, who will definitely be able to see the monopole that will definitely impact his view. They can expect to hear from him on the topic either through Ms. Baldwin or at the County Board of Supervisors meeting when this is addressed. The 110' monopole is going on a bank on the west side of Route 20. Along that stretch it goes up a very steep hill, which is part of the reason why the driveway has the hairpin turn in it. The base of tower will be about 25' or 30' above the level of the road, which makes it that much more prominent in the views from the road and adjacent properties.

Corky Shackleford said he lives within three mile of this site along the crooked road. He understands that this group is naturally concerned with the appearance and the visual impact of the monopole. He is more concerned with what they need out of it. Along that road he could probably count on one hand the spots where someone can get

any coverage at all on the telephone. He cannot get any coverage within his house and has to go to certain spots high up on the farm to get a signal. They need coverage badly all along that road from here to Barboursville and who knows how much further. He would encourage them to consider this request as favorably as they can.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Planning Commission for discussion and action.

Mr. Morris asked if the applicant wanted to take advantage of five minutes for rebuttal.

Ms. Schweller said she appreciates Mr. Fleming's comments. It is correct that his best view would be from across the road because those properties are on an elevation. However, she would point out that even though the subject parcel is at higher elevation than the road it is within a forested area and there is a whole bank of trees in front of it. So it is very well screened. Only the very top, as the photos show, would be visible. The top of the monopole has to be visible for it to work because that is where the antennas are and how they propagate the signal. They have minimized the visibility as much as they possibly can in the area and think they have done a pretty good job. She asked that they consider the importance of the service in this area as well as the diminishment of the visibility.

Mr. Morris invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Dotson asked Ms. Schweller if she had a chance to look at the drawings that were passed out to the Commissioners. He asked about whether that representation of what the tower would look like is accurate and consistent with her understanding.

Ms. Schweller replied she was not sure what these are drawings of.

Mr. Morris asked Ms. Schweller to summarize the conversation because the Commissioners could not hear a thing.

Ms. Schweller explained the drawing passed out to the Commission. Mr. Fleming was telling her one photo was taken from the home site that has been demolished. The other photo is from the front of the house. When their engineers do photo simulations they are very careful to use scientific methodology to make sure that they appear the actual height that they will be. When they do a balloon test and they take photographs they know exactly how far they are from those and how big the poles should be. First of all what they are seeing is that it looks huge. She did not believe it is going to be this obtrusive. These are not flush mounted antennas. A flush mounted antenna is not visible from this distance since it would just look like part of the pole. It just would not look like this. She asked to take them back to her presentation. Mr. Fleming's property is directly south of the one where they drove up the drive to a certain degree and took a photo. They did not drive onto his property and don't have a photo from that area. She knows they have one photo from Rivanna Farm where it was not visible at all. They drove all over that property. It is just hard to say what the visibility would be. She pointed out in a photo simulation that the monopole is a very slender pole and has flush mounted antennas. It would not look like this simulation.

Mr. Dotson suggested it might be useful before this went to the Board to prepare the type of photo simulation she was speaking about from the property of the speaker.

Ms. Schweller said they might be able to do that. They would need to have another balloon test in order to do that because they would not guess.

Mr. Morris closed the public hearing to bring SP-2012-00031 back to the Planning Commission for discussion and action.

Mr. Dotson said he picked up on a point that Mr. Loach raised as a question at the beginning. He did not have a good memory to know whether they are actually seeing 7' above the tree or 10' or 15'. He did not want 15' to become the new norm unless the ordinance is amended. It may be forthcoming. If this is a special exception they should be saying what is special about this application. He thinks from Mr. Morris' comments if they preceded any motion to approve with something like because of the unusual rolling topography and location of the tower, then they should go ahead. He did not want the next application to come along and be a very different site and have set a precedent of 15'. His concern is 15' might work here, but not at other places.

Mr. Randolph pointed out they are looking at 429 inches larger than what is normally acceptable, which is a 37% larger antenna. He echoed Mr. Dotson's point that he did not want this to be the new norm. They have to be very careful in this case. It may be appropriate and applicable, but in terms of precedent he did not want this to come back and be used as the basis to argue they should go even higher. For example, let's go 50 percent larger than what is usually acceptable to the County.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Kamptner if he had any problem recommending this.

Mr. Kamptner replied no.

Mr. Loach noted the Commission's action was only a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. However, just to make a point he won't support it since he thinks it is important that they start to get additional feedback. If they are going to change the standard because the technology is changing, he felt it should be done so there can be an open discussion.

Motion: Mr. Smith moved to recommend approval of the modification of SP-2012-00031 Verizon Wireless "Eastham" Fox Property Tier III Personal Wireless Service Facility with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Randolph seconded the motion.

Mr. Kamptner clarified there was a single condition that staff noted.

Mr. Smith agreed it was a single condition.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:1. (Mr. Loach voted nay)

Mr. Morris noted the next motion would be on the special exceptions.

Motion: Mr. Smith moved and Mr. Randolph seconded to recommend approval of SP-2012-00031 Verizon Wireless "Eastham" Fox Property Tier III Personal Wireless Service Facility with the condition outlined in the staff report. He also suggested that the applicant try to have a picture from that location for the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Kamptner questioned the motion because the condition should be attached to the special use permit and not to the modifications.

Mr. Benish noted typically they do the special exceptions first. The condition does need to go with the special use permit and not the special exception.

Mr. Kamptner suggested a motion to reconsider so they could undo what they did.

Motion: Mr. Franco moved and Mr. Smith seconded to reconsider the requests.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Kamptner suggested they go back and restate the motion.

Ms. Baldwin pointed out the correct order of the motions was on the screen.

Motion for Modifications: Mr. Franco moved and Mr. Randolph seconded to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve modifications for Sections 5.1.40(c)(3) and (d)(6) under the special exception criteria of Section 31.8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

- Section 5.1.40(c)(3)-size of antenna
- Section 5.1.40(d)(6)-height of the antenna in relation to the reference tree.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:1. (Loach voted nay)

Motion for Special Use Permit: Mr. Franco moved and Mr. Randolph seconded to recommend approval of SP-2012-00031 Verizon Wireless "Eastham" Fox Property Tier III Personal Wireless Service Facility with the condition outlined in the staff report.

1. Development and use shall be in general accord with what is described in the applicant's request and site plans, entitled "Eastham," with a final zoning drawing submittal date of 11/06/12 (hereafter "Conceptual Plan"), as determined by the Director of Planning and Zoning Administrator.

   Minor modifications to the plan which do not conflict with the elements above may be made to ensure compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:1. (Loach voted nay)

Mr. Morris noted that SP-2012-00031 Verizon Wireless "Eastham" Fox Property Tier III

Personal Wireless Service Facility and the special exception for modification requests would go to the Board of Supervisors on a date to be determined with a recommendation for approval. He thanked the applicant for being flexible and taking a look at the driveway.

Work Session

CPA201300001 Comprehensive Plan Update
Community Facilities – Schools Section (Elaine Echols)

Review of Community Facilities - Schools
Elaine Echols presented information and recommendations for the proposed Comp Plan Community Facilities Section on Schools. Staff asked the Commission to provide direction on changes needed to the site grading recommendations and whether multi-school sites should be emphasized in the plan.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Jeff Werner, with Piedmont Environmental Council, offered the following:

- Not everybody will walk to school, but having neighborhood schools and the ability to walk to school will be helpful to reduce the number of miles on school buses.
- The County should look at other localities for innovative things that can be done on school sites to promote walking and bicycling.

Mr. Morris closed the public comment to bring the matter before the Planning Commission for discussion and to provide comments and recommendations.

The Planning Commission held a discussion on the proposed Comp Plan Community Facilities Section on Schools. Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Having elementary schools in neighborhoods is important especially when you think of size and scale of the school and fields. The Crozet Master plan recommends this. If you want to see problems with multi-school sites, drive on Route 250 in front of the school complex in the morning or in the afternoon when school lets out. Walkable schools support the Neighborhood Model

- Can staff provide information on the percentage of children who walk to school? What is the School Division's view on planning the schools?

- If future elementary schools are built in Pantops, it would be nice if they were neighborhood schools.

- We recognize there are safety factors associated with walking to school. There needs to be the right balance. Also, walking and bicycling will not be possible in all locations in the County because of wide and heavily trafficked streets.

- Bicycling to school should be promoted as much as walking to school.

- The key to success will be implementation. We need to be talking with Schools about how to develop strategies for non-vehicular transportation to school.

- Having multi-story schools is a good idea.

- If school site size is a problem in the growth areas, we should look for opportunities to redevelop sites such as shopping centers.

Planning Commission Recommendations:

- Move the content of Objective 12 into the list of bullets in Objective 14.
- Add bicycling to the recommendations to all

Staff was asked to take the comments into consideration in the Comp Plan Update. No formal action taken.

There being no further comments, the meeting moved to the next item.

Old Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

Joint Planning Commissions' Vision, Goals, and Priorities

- Mr. Morris asked for comments on the joint Planning Commission vision, goals and priorities to be emailed before next Tuesday, February 12 to Ms. Echols or himself. They would then get with the City and hammer them out.

There being no further old business, the meeting proceeded.

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

Ms. Echols noted that next week's review would include the following three items:

- Priority areas Neighborhood 4 through 7.
- Monticello Viewshed
- 37 page document – Neighborhood Model Principles (Note: Alley comments have not been incorporated – but staff had not forgotten)

- Mr. Randolph discussed HB1430 right to farm act bill being considered by the Virginia General Assembly.

- The Planning Commission discussed how to handle the public hearing process in the most productive manner for the final review of the draft Comp Plan. It was

agreed that the public comment should be taken first before the Commission's discussion and consideration of the final document. The public should be encouraged to email comments to give the Commission an opportunity to look over prior to the public hearing.

- THE NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BE ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2013 AT 6:00 p.m.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m. to the Tuesday, February 12, 2013 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Auditorium, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)